

OLC 401 Summarizing Text Practice

Now, if you want to stop violence, if you want to stop wars, how much vitality, how much of yourself, do you give to it? Isn't it important to you that your children are killed, that your sons go into the army where they are bullied and butchered? Don't you care? My God, if that doesn't interest you, what does? Guarding your money? Having a good time? Taking drugs? Don't you see that this violence in yourself is destroying your children? Or do you see it only as some abstraction?

All right then, if you are interested, attend with all your heart and mind to find out. Don't just sit back and say, 'Well, tell us all about it'. I point out to you that you cannot look at anger nor at violence with eyes that condemn or justify and that if this violence is not a burning problem to you, you cannot put those two things away. So first you have to learn; you have to learn how to look at anger, how to look at your husband, your wife, your children; you have to listen to the politician, you have to learn why you are not objective, why you condemn or justify. You have to learn that you condemn and justify because it is part of the social structure you live in, your conditioning as a German or an Indian or a Negro or an American or whatever you happen to have been born, with all the dulling of the mind that this conditioning results in. To learn, to discover, something fundamental you must have the capacity to go deeply. If you have a blunt instrument, a dull instrument, you cannot go deeply. So what we are doing is sharpening the instrument which is the mind - the mind which has been made dull by all this justifying and condemning. You can penetrate deeply only if your mind is as sharp as a needle and as strong as a diamond.

It is no good just sitting back and asking, 'How am I to get such a mind'? You have to want it as you want your next meal, and to have it you must see that what makes your mind dull and stupid is this sense of invulnerability which has built walls round itself and which is part of this condemnation and justification. If the mind can be rid of that, then you can look, study, penetrate, and perhaps come to a state that is totally aware of the whole problem.

To investigate the fact of your own anger you must pass non-judgemental on it, for the moment you conceive of its opposite you condemn it and therefore you cannot see it as it is. When you say you dislike or hate someone that is a fact, although it sounds terrible. If you look at it, go into it completely, it ceases, but if you say, 'I must not hate; I must have love in my heart', then you are living in a hypocritical world with double standards. To live completely, fully, in the moment is to live with what is, the actual, without any sense of condemnation or justification - then you understand it so totally that you are finished with it. When you see clearly the problem is solved.

But can you see the face of violence clearly - the face of violence not only outside you but inside you, which means that you are totally free from violence because you have not admitted ideology through which to get rid of it? This requires very deep meditation, not just a verbal agreement or disagreement. You have now read a series of statements but have you really understood? Your conditioned mind, your way of life, the whole structure of the society in which you live, prevent you from looking at a fact and being entirely free from it immediately. You say, 'I will think about it; I will consider whether it is possible to be free from violence or not. I will try to be free.' That is one of the most dreadful statements you can make, 'I will try'. There is no trying, no doing your best. Either you do it or you don't do it. You are admitting time while the house is burning. The house is burning as a result of the violence throughout the world and in yourself and you say, 'Let me think about it. Which ideology is best to put

out the fire?' When the house is on fire, do you argue about the colour of the hair of the man who brings the water?

Article 2

Illustrations and stories in United States primary school textbooks tend to convince young girls that they should be 'passive' and 'dependent' creatures who need aspire only to lives of service to their future husbands and children, a conference of educators was told here yesterday.

Speaking at the first national conference on schools and sex role stereotypes, a University of California professor said a study of the 100 most widely used elementary text-books demonstrated that girls are constantly depicted as dependent on and subservient to boys.

Louise White, of the U.S. Office of Education, told the conference that the female stereotype presented to elementary school children was so overwhelming that by the time most girls reached fourth grade they believed they had only four occupations open to them - nurse, secretary, teacher, or mother.

The director of the elementary school textbook study, Lenore Weitzman, of the University of California, said that texts in spelling, reading, mathematics, science, and social studies were examined.

Most stories and illustrations tended to centre on boys rather than girls, and those boys tended to demonstrate qualities of strength, intelligence, love of adventure, independence, and courage.

Girls, however, were depicted in passive roles. Usually they were inside a house, and often they were helping with housework or playing with dolls.

When boys and girls appeared together in a text, she said, the girls were either watching the boys do something or they were helping the boys.

Adult men appearing in elementary school texts were depicted in various jobs - astronaut, truck driver, policeman, cowboy, scientist, banker - in addition to the role of father.

But the overwhelming picture of women that emerged from the elementary texts was that of mother and housewife. Even at that, said Professor Weitzman, the picture was one of a woman performing simple but time-consuming chores. It failed completely to reflect the complexities facing a modern housewife.

A study was done by an affiliate of the Central New Jersey National Organisation for women on 34 books published by 14 major publishing companies and involving 2,760 stories for elementary school children. According to the findings the composite housewife or mother was a 'limited, colourless, mindless creature...' Not only does she wash, cook, clean, nurse, and find mittens: these chores constitute her only happiness.

'In illustration, she frequently appears in the servant's posture, body slightly bent forward, hands clasped, eyes riveted on the master of the house or the children.'

In contrast, the typical father found in the study was 'the "good guy" in the family. He's where the fun is. He builds things with his children and takes them hunting, fishing and up in planes. He solves the problems.'

The effect of this on young girls, Professor Weitzman said, is to make them think their role is to serve others. They think they should be attractive so that they can please others and although they generally

have better academic records than boys by the time they reach adolescence, they value academic and scholastic excellence less than boys do.